

REMARKS

In the aforementioned Non-Final Office Action, claims 1-18 were pending and presented for examination. Claims 1-5 and 7-18 were rejected. Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the following remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the aforementioned Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in light of U.S. Patent Number 6,253,293 to Rao et al. (hereinafter *Rao*). Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 6 including accessing data in a four-cycle pipeline structure in a pre-multiplication function, in an IFFT function, and in a post-multiplication function; accessing data in a six-cycle pipeline structure in a biquad mode; and accessing data in a nine-cycle pipeline structure in a double precision biquad mode. These additional limitations are not taught by *Rao* and the 35 USC § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 is, therefore, overcome.

Applicants have cancelled claim 2 thereby making the Examiner's 35 USC 102(e) rejection as to claim 2 moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the aforementioned Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5 and 7-12 as being unpatentable over *Rao* in light of U.S. patent number 6,430,529 to Huang and U.S. patent number 6,405,227 to Prakash. Applicants have cancelled claims 3-5 and 7-12 thereby making the Examiner's 35 USC 103 rejection of these claims moot.

The Examiner also rejected claims 13-18 under 35 USC § 103 in light of U.S. patent number 6,405,227 to Prakash. Applicants have cancelled claims 13-18 thereby making the Examiner's rejection as to claims 13-18 moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claim 6 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated claim 6 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for identifying allowable subject matter and have incorporated all the limitations of claim 6 into rejected base claim 1 from which claim 6 depends. Through this incorporation, the objection to claim 6 is overcome as is the Examiner's 35 USC § 102(e) rejection of claim 1 as addressed above.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments, only claims directed to allowable subject matter remain pending and the application is, therefore, in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Kent Vuong et al.

Date: August 19, 2004

By:



Susan Yee, Reg. No. 41,388
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 812-3400
Fax: (650) 812-3444